

REMARKS

Claim 1 is now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buszkohl (U.S. Pat. No. 4,958,395, hereinafter "Buszkohl") in view of Lester (U.S. Pat. No. 4,930,377, hereinafter "Lester"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that neither Buszkohl nor Lester teach a blade holder being cast around the tail of a blade. While the Examiner states that "it is old and well known in the art to form a blade and connector by casting," no references are cited to this effect. The Examiner further states that "[i]t appears that the blade holder 42 is cast around the tail of the blade 40 in Lester." Lester merely discloses an elongated shaft 44 extending from a tool and a collar 42 defined adjacent to the shaft. There is no evidence of the "cast around" feature in Lester. Buszkohl shows a coupling head 16 fixed to a blade 13 by what appears to be some sort of fastener, not casting. None of the cited references provide any motivation for the cast feature of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that the references cited by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest the present invention. "The mere fact that prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (citing In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900,

902, 221 USPQ 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). Even if Lester did "appear" to disclose a blade holder cast to a blade, there is no clear suggestion or motivation provided by the reference to make the Examiner's proposed combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10-14-05

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWM/JMP
J:\HDP Forms\Client Forms\BlackDecker (0275_, 6736, 8913)\Amendment Form.dot